TO MY FRIENDS AND PATRONS:—

THE present pamphlet of PALÆSTRA contains Nos. 23—24, which in its Latin text mbraces all the subjects I had intended o treat in Part I, but I regret that I ould not bring in all the English explanations of the grammatical principles, so that much of the Adverbiis, all the Præpositiones and Coniunctiones had to be left over, to be treated in the next issue. That same pamphlet, Nos. 25—26, will also start Part II, in which the grammatical portion will contain the *Versus Memoriales* of EMMANVEL ALVARVS, the teacher of Latin of all generations of all countries since the days of Reformation up to my time, and including me.

Several numbers of Palæstra had been exhausted, but I have got them all reprinted, so that new subscribers may secure complete sets as far as published by either sending cash orders of $5.00 for the complete work, or $2.50, as a first installment; I shall mail in both cases all numbers issued at the date.

* * *

No. 4 of the *Fabulæ Tusculanæ* will also soon appear with very choice contents, of which I mention here *Cicada & Noctua, Aper & Vulpes, Leo & Rana, Anseres & Grues, Puer Mendax, &c.* This enterprise has been undertaken to supply teachers of Latin with ready material to enliven class work by telling stories in Latin. It is not a business venture, but a matter of principle, for I am giving away the whole work entirely gratis to willing and asking teachers. Other people may have them at 10 cents each number. These fables are not reprints or translations of Æsopus or copies of Phædrus, but freely rewritten in narrative form, in easier Latin which any teacher can understand, and for his accommodation Latin notes and paraphrasing some sentences are added; while nearly all words of the text are repeated in a lexicographic order after each lesson, and questions are added, so as to offer safe guiding in putting questions to his classes.

* * *

Of the serial MOUNT HOPE CLASSICS, of which *Pericla Navarchi Magonis*, published last winter, was the first volume, has just been published another, the *Mysterium Arcæ Boulé*, a bound volume of VI + 320 pp., by Burton E. Stevenson, (by Messrs. Dodd, Mead & Co., New York), translated by [illegible] Latin, privately published by [illegible] *malee Prentice, Esq.*, 37 Wall Street, New York City, price $3.50, while they last. Only 250 copies have been printed, and only a portion of them is offered for sale. The work is a very clever detective story, entirely up-to-date, which means that a number of foot-notes had to be added on account of new Latin terminology to express the most modern conceptions,

* * *

The *Acta Societatis Gentium Latinæ*, is the official publication of the INTERNATIONAL LATIN SOCIETY, Inc., only 4 pp., imperial 8° is obtainable gratis by anybody interested in our work, by writing to *Chandler Davis, Esq.*, Consulting Engineer, No. 1 Broadway, New York City.

WHAT OUR SCHOOLMEN DO NOT KNOW.

THE LATIN faculty of the College of a great Western State University is experimenting with PALAESTRA. The teachers have selected six boys and girls from the city High Schools for the purpose of drilling them in Latin speech. If the experiment turns out well, to the faculty's satisfaction, this method is to be recommended by the faculty to the State Board of Education, to be universally adopted for all the High Schools throughout the State.

I mention this fact so that other earnest teachers may feel encouraged in the same direction. The teachers usually lack a sufficiently strong confidence in their own ability successfully to undertake such an enterprise, because they have not been professionally and practically trained in the skill of speaking Latin with ease. I do not think, however, that the best element of our teachers lack the knowledge of the mechanism of the language; they only lack practice and example. The means I am offering to remedy this fault are both practical and adequate. The fundamental deficiency is not in the lack of ability, or opportunity, in the abstract, but very largely in the [illegible]s, as if Latin were a mere pedagogical contrivance for "mental gymnastics" in its declensions and conjugations, and helps to "English spelling," while the Roman authors, or some of them, called "the Classics," are devices for translating and talking English. While teachers are allowed to thrive on such programs, the largest majority will skip along silently, and heed not the bitter criticism of the community; the rest busies itself with writing apologies and gathering arguments for proving the utility of Latin, without moving their fingers to improve their knowledge, "let the devil take the hindmost."

Since, however, even our best teachers do not in fact realize why through all these centuries all nations have retained Latin as the centre of our Roman civilization; and, since the question is rapidly approaching to a definite issue, I have made up my mind to explain the issue.

In the face of the victorious swords of the Central Powers, wielded by the schoolmasters, both in England and here people are "mobilizing" their resources in finance, in industries, and the war-cry of "preparedness" is being shouted in the market places. But in England people see more clearly that it is the schoolmaster again who is at work, and the London Times' *Educational Supplement* for December 7th, 1915, sounds the alarm in four articles, calling for a revolution in education. One of these articles is a contribution by t Vice Chancellor of the University of Leed two others are editorials, and one is a "lett to the Editor."

The first writer seems to lose his way words while trying to point out the five defec of the English system of education. The fi of these defects is "the absence of an exacti standard in the training of the mind." good statement, to which I shall soon retur The first editorial is "Revolution on Seconda Education." In this the main contention the writer is that "secondary" education, whi he (rightfully) prefers to call "intermediate should be *nationalized*, and be made oblig tory. He approves the place of the "classic in education, but significantly adds: "B nevertheless, it is the teacher, not the wa that really matters," and concludes: "The cri cisms aimed at our proposals convince us mo than ever that an educational revolution necessary." The second editorial bears th caption "Philosophy for Parents." The writ of the article, like everybody born in the Eng lish language, does not really mean *Philosoph* but the effects of training in Philosophy. shall refer to this subject presently. The co respondent, too, employs too many words t bring out the main thought, that there are 38 Educational Committees, and a large numbe of lesser authorities controlling school matte in England, and so responsibility is split to much. A Minister of Public Education ough to be invested with more sweeping, thoug not absolute, authority.

To sum it up all: 1. English education lack *set standards*, i. e., standards for all grades o schools, in curricula, in text-books, in qualifica tions of teachers, in preparedness of thos entering the universities, and in conferring de grees.

2. England needs a nationalizing of her in termediate, or middle schools. There are thre grades of schools; the elementary, the middle and high educational schools. To the firs group, in America, belond the gramma schools; to the second, the high schools an colleges, as they are but the upper four grade of a high school, all else in them in Americ is a usurpation and confusion of universit rights and the misunderstanding of the hier achy of knowledge; to the third group, tha of the high education, belong the universit and the Polytechnicum (in America also usurped in equal manner, and for the same reason, by the university). A nation that i not indifferent towards its future, certainly it must nationalize all its schools, so that these be subjected to the same public authorities o

e State, and uniform standards, set by the tate.

4. "Classical" education should remain, because "in the hands of skilled teachers it rings the scholar's mind into direct contact with the genius of the great writers of great ges." Mark the plural! The writer meant mply the *Latin* and *Greek Languages and etters*, not the few so-called "classical" aurors, but all great authors of all great ages. his, precisely, is the dead line, which is responsible for the decay in education in all he world, in the English-speaking in particur. The unanimous agreement of the nations preserving Latin and Greek did not aim at pelling, parsing, translating passages of a few ooks, or at writing criticisms, dissertations on *t, ne, quominus, "cum" constructions*, archaisms, respelling words, names of Romans, and he like puerilities, but they aimed at the preervation of Latin speech, Latin writing, as illustrated by the examples of men like Virchow, Mommsen, corresponding with their monarch, Emperor William, in Latin; or as Tsar Ferdinand of Bulgaria, greeting Emperor William at Nish in Latin: *"Ave Imperator, Caeser & Rex, victor & gloriosus! Ex Nissa antiqua omnes Orientis populi te salutant remptorem ferentem oppressis prosperitatem tque salutem. Vivas!"* When our rulers, diplomats and statesmen cannot do this much, hen Latin is only a subterfuge and a fraud, our teachers palming off gold brick on a credulous public.

5. England has not the "skilled teachers." Neither do we have them. Such teachers can e only turned out by professional Latin and Greek training schools, which neither of us has. Young men are appointed to teach with paper-qualification, i. e., a college diploma, which does not qualify for teaching any more han for practicing law or medicine. Being hus unqualified, the teacher must resort to subterfuges, evasions and philology, if he neans to hold his place. This is all the more easy, since neither the State, nor the municipalty, or corporations that employ him, have expert inspectors either to look into the quality of work done, or to set standards for him. While steamers, boilers, elevators, banks, etc., are more or less controlled by inspection, teaching of Latin and Greek is free to all, nobody is looking at the fingers, and so it is small wonder if such teaching falls in line with the adulteration of food, drugs, measures and the like.

PHILOSOPHY FOR THE PARENTS.

ALL THESE causes of the failure of education in the English-speaking countries are not the first and fundamental ones; they are the secondary causes, or consequences of the initial ones.

The first and fundamental cause is the constitution of the English mind averse to painstaking, detailed and dogged determination to study a thing in detail. The second shortcoming is the lack of dignity, whereby adults play, and play is exalted, carried on with unreasoning ostentation, setting the worst conceivable example to induce aversion from study. As an outgrowth of this immorality is the desire to reach a certain end without the intervening stages, "get rich quick!" Thus, students run to Germany not for education, but for "degrees." Still another cause is that all children begin schooling too late. And still another is the almost total absence of home-education, home-discipline, a monkey-love, or affectation of love, of children, depriving them of all restraint, all good example, all parental authority.

When such children, which have never tasted severe study, discipline, restraint, authority, having spent a life in "ponies," subterfuges, evasions, games, plays, "mirth" and amusements, themselves are appointed to a "job," can they be expected to have acquired "skill" in anything sober? He has never realized what teaching and education meant, until he is to deliver his first "lecture." He was never "taught," he has only "heard lectures." He will never *teach*, he will *lecture*, i. e., he will preach, and assign lessons. He knows no language, least of all Latin. With no home education, with overburdened and long dragged out primary education, with uncontrolled private secondary education, no nation can expect crops of trained and "skilled" secondary teachers; and so, if a nation knows enough assuredly it will not jeopardize its destiny by leaving its secondary education to the uncertainties of private enterprise. For, unless a responsible body of experts set the standards, and prescribe the curricula, subjects, like languages and Philosophy, where detailed knowledge is required, and no "lectures" can be substituted, are sure to be omitted, or if they cannot be so omitted, as in the case of languages, philology will be smuggled in, and Latin smothered.

To illustrate my point, and to show why the Parents do not get the Philosophy the TIMES' editorial demands, I insert a letter clipped from the New York EVENING POST:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING POST:

"Sir: I write a few hasty notes on the letter of your correspondent, Jo-

seph Dick, Herschel's discource is easily procured. See the 'Principles of Science,' by Stanley Jevons. Watt's 'Logic' I have read here in Latin. The copy is in the Columbia College Library. De Morgan's 'Formal Logic' is rare. There is a copy in the Mercantile Library. Dr. Whewell's works, I think, can be obtained from Leary & Stewart, Ninth and Market Streets, Philadelphia. Spencer Baynes published a translation of the 'Port Royal Logic. I have not been able to obtain it. See his 'Essay on the Quantification of the Predicate,' London, *circa* 1835, and Sir W. Hamilton's works. If I might advise, your correspondent will find much to interest him in Wundt's 'Logic;' 'Sigwart,' translated by Miss Dendy; in Whately and Jevons. Logic, I fear, is ill taught in our schools. PAUL BARTHOLOW, New York, December 10 (1915)."

When such is the scarcity of little essays on Logic, one can rightfully fear that Logic is not only "ill taught," but that it is not taught at all, because it does not yield to preaching, it must be *known*. But this is not all. I have to add, that in all the world's English literature there does not exist a text-book of *formal Philosophy*, and, consequently, no formal Philosophy is taught in all the English-speaking world!

What must one then think of the degree of "Doctor Philosophiae?" A doctorate of Philosophy, with Philosophy left out! We are answered, of course, that Philosophy is being taught in all colleges and universities. They mean that something is being taught about Philosophy, i. e., philosophical (metaphysical) speculations of some German authors, the teachers thinking in all earnest that that is Philosophy, for they have never seen a text-book of Philosophy, not knowing Latin, and there being none in English. The difference between formal Philosophy and what they now call Philosophy is the same as between lectures on Byzantine, Gothic, Greek architecture and teaching how to build. A very decided difference. Why the English Parents lack Philosophy, now it must be clear. It is a "hard study." the subject does not lend itself to "preaching," as do philosophical speculations, which are nothing else than "preaching" without beginning or end, undemonstrable, requiring no knowledge, giving no professional qualification, teaching nothing.

Fancy now whole nations so educated, without the knowledge of any language from a President, through the diplomats, Secretaries of State, Governors, Senators, presidents of colleges, editors, professors, down to track-walkers. Why is it so? Because the schools are not "nationalized," without prescribed curricula, set standard, expert inspection, a free, uncontrolled education, in which all the "hard" studies are evaded, and counterfeits are freely substituted, such as philology for Latin, lectures on Hegel, Schopenhauer, etc., in the place of formal and painstaking teaching and exercising Philosophy, for the teaching of which Latin has been preserved as its vehicle.

WHAT FOLLOWS FROM THE LACK OF PHILOSOPHY.

THOSE who do not know Latin in the proper sense, are not familiar with the scholastic Latin traditions, and, as a consequence, do not understand scholastic terms, such as *university, college, art, liberal arts, humanities, degrees, etc.,* nor with scholastic etiquette, functions of schools, classification of knowledge what are school-subjects, and the like. Let me put to test some of these terms.

1. UNIVERSITY.—Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines it: "(L. *universitas*, whole universe, a body corporate or society, corporation, fr. *universus*, universal). 1. An association, society, guild, or corporation. (*Obs.*) 2. An institution organized and incorporated for the purpose of imparting instruction, examining students, etc., in the higher branches of literature, science, art, etc., and empowered to confer degrees. A university may exist without having any college connected with it."

The first striking feature of this definition is that the compiling or revising "classical" professors, unfamiliar with practical Latin and scholasticism, are seeking to read into this old Roman word a meaning and idea of more than a thousand years' later origin! Otherwise the definition clearly shows that neither the author, nor the revisers, had any idea what the word means, or what a university is; they simply cannot define either the word, or the thing. If they do not know either, they certainly cannot know the functions of a university: if they did know the functions, spheres of duties of a university, they could easily define it.

Since England is everlastingly quoted in America, as a kind of ultima ratio, and as arbitra in all matters, let me consider whether English schoolmen know these things better than Americans. I take again the *Education Supplement* of the London TIMES. In its third year, (Feb. 9, 1912) No. 18, page 14, publication is reviewed, "The Meaning of

University," an inaugural address delivered to the students of University College Aberystwith, by Sir Walter Raleigh. Amongst the praises by the reviewer we read: "The Professor is not to be lured aside into any morass of verbal definitions. 'We cannot define familiar notions.' Universities, he reminds us, are one of the great bequests of the Middle Ages," etc.

Had the Professor been steeped in Latin, as every decent Latinist is expected to be, that "morass" would have been his very element, and he would have plunged into it like a duck, entirely unsolicited.

Finally, I could not quote a higher English authority on this subject than ALEX. HILL, Dr. Med., F. R. C. S., Secretary of the Congress of Universities of the British Empire, numbering 53 in all, who in August, 1912, delivered a lecture at Cambridge on "What Is a University?" This lecture was published in the October number of ARENA, now defunct. This learned man has abundantly explained what a University was *not*, not a building, not a curriculum, not a body of men, but just *what* it was, he did not state.

Perhaps, after all, the various boards of education, of trustees, directors, regents, overseers, faculties, even if not able to define what a university may be, they do know by experience and practice what it is, as suggested above. If so, how does it happen that no university in all the English-speaking world has a set and definite curriculum, course, or program? For whenever the daily papers happen to bring before the community any new fad, some of the so-called universities (and colleges) are promptly in the market offering "courses" in the respective fads. Some of these institutions have already as many as 280 "courses," which is far in excess over all branches of human knowledge. This one well-known fact is a sufficient evidence that our schoolmen do not know what they are doing.

2. COLLEGE.—Webster's definition: "F. *college*, L. *collegium*; fr. *collega*, colleague). 2. A society of scholars or friends of learning incorporated for study or instruction, especially in the higher branches of knowledge."

Whether the Roman word *collegium* is derived from *collega*, as the German lexicographer Freund has it, whence this etymology is copied word for word, that I leave for the German doctors to discuss; the fact is, that the word College, as a mediaeval institution, has nothing in common with that question. This fact again proves that the definers and revisers are entirely unfamiliar either with the word or with the thing, or rather both.

That a college is not "a society of scholars," whether the term be applied to the trustees, or to the teachers, is well known; but the Roman etymology had to be met. Neither is the material definition correct. For already the university is credited with "imparting instruction in the higher branches of literature, science, art, etc." Is then the college identical with the university, since it is "incorporated for study or instruction, especially in the higher branches of knowledge?" We are, moreover, told that a university can be without a college. If so, then the college can stand alone without the university; why then should it be *with* a university? In this case, what does the term "college department" mean? Is a college a "department" of a university? If so, are the teachers of a college "Professors" of the university, with the power of conferring degrees? When not so joined, are the same teachers also "Professors," with the same rights? If not, why not? The fact is that colleges do confer "honorary" degrees in Philosophy (of course without Philosophy), and of Law (without a faculty of jurisprudence), and medical colleges regularly confer the degree of doctorate in medicine, as though "Doctor" meant "a physician."

So much will suffice to show what an amount of confusion exists in the minds of our schoolmen concerning schools and their respective functions. They simply had no Latin education, all is English, without the vaguest idea of formal Philosophy, consequently there is a crying need of "Revolution in Education."

"THE HIGHER BRANCHES OF KNOWLEDGE."

3. As the university is "imparting instruction—in the higher branches of literature, science, art, etc.," while the college imparts instruction, especially in the "higher branches of knowledge," the natural inference must be that the college is a higher institution than the university, for literature and arts would seem to be less than the "higher branches of knowledge;" for, in reality, "higher" in this connection means the "highest," there being no counter-part to the comparative employed. If this is not the case, then, not only the etymology is mistaken with the general idea, but also the functions of the respective schools. In order to unravel this tangle, I have to resort to further definitions, and find out what at least *art* means.

a.—Webster: ART (F. fr. L. *ars, artis,* orig. skill in joining or fitting.) 1. The employment of means to accomplish some desired end. 2. A system of principles and rules for attaining a desired end; method of doing well some

special work; distinguished from science.—. *pl.* Those branches of learning which are taught in the academical course of colleges. 5. Learning; study; applied knowledge (*Archaic*). THE LIBERAL ARTS (*artes liberales,* which, among the Romans, only freemen were permitted to pursue) were, in the Middle Ages, grammar, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy. In modern times the *liberal arts* include the sciences, philosophy, history, etc., which compose the course of academical or collegiate education. Hence, degrees in the *arts;* master and bachelor of *arts.*"

So, then, the college *does* teach arts, though not so credited in the definition, while the university does not, although so credited.

Under No. 5 is the true definition of art, i. e., "applied knowledge," be it bricklaying, shoemaking, cooking, medicine, astronomy, from the time of Prometheus to the present day, despite the remark of the compilers, *Archaic, Mediaeval, Modern.* Had the conceptions of knowledge and of art changed from "archaic" to "mediaeval," and thence to "modern," the compilers would have to tell us *when,* and *by whom* were they so changed. Subjective changes, as they exist in the minds of men of Latin philosophical education, and men without such education, are only one conceivable; these are truths immutable and eternal. That they are so, and the compilers are confused in their conceptions, I shall show by their own words in the following definition of their own:

Under the head of MEDICINE they say: "1. The science which relates to the prevention, cure, alleviation of disease."—Mark that they call medicine a *science* here. Under MEDICAL they say: "1. Of, pertaining to, or having to do with the art of healing disease, or the science of medicine." Medicine, then, in their own words, is a *science,* and it is also an *art,* according to their own confession; when did then art cease to be an applied knowledge? Is then this definition "archaic?" is it "mediaeval?" Is art a different notion, or conception in one age, one country, with one race than with another? or the compilers' minds are confused?

If, then, art is an applied knowledge, and students in colleges study a score of "arts" which must be knowledge first, and then be applied; then I ask: Do those students apply grammar, logic, chemistry, history, Latin, Greek, mathematics, physics, the same as physicians practice medicine? If they do not, as they certainly do not, then several things must follow, to wit:

A. That nothing a college teaches is either science or art;

B. That no student can be a "master," or a "bachelor" of any science or art;

C. That "Magister," or "Baccalaureus Scientiarum" or "Artium" is no degree at all;

D. That a college has no right or authority to confer any degrees whatsoever.

All that our schoolmen know about these things are mere hearsay.

That *artes liberales* were so called, because none but free-born men could practice them in Rome, is also but a hearsay. Do we not know that Terentius and Phaedrus were slaves, but freed because of their talents? Were not all the "paedagogi" slaves?

In another definition our compilers say: "LIBERAL. 1. Free by birth; hence, befitting a freeman, or gentleman; refined; noble; independent," but they wrongfully add: "Not servile or mean." From this definition of theirs, which is correct, our schoolmen are radically wrong when they think that college-studies are *artes liberales.* Since they nowhere mention *artes illiberales,* I must conclude that they have no knowledge of the existence of such things. If such were not the case, how could "liberales" exist? Then, if some *artes* are *liberales,* or "befitting gentlemen," those others do not befit gentlemen, and if such are still practiced, such practitioners are no gentlemen. Hence the teaching and the practicing of certain arts creates aristocrats, the others make plebeians. What becomes of our much vaunted "democratic" education?

Now let me take one more definition, that of *Science. b.* Webster: "SCIENCE. 1. Knowledge; knowledge of principles and causes; ascertained truth or facts. 2 Accumulated and established knowledge systematized and formulated with reference to the discovery of general truths or the operation of general laws; comprehensive, profound, or philosophical knowledge, especially when it relates to the physical world and its phoenomena."

Human knowledge has been formulated and classified by Aristoteles, and after him by Thomas Aquinas, bringing Greek and Roman thought in harmony with Hebraic thought, new to the western world, and his giant mind constructed formal Philosophy, digested by his disciples, the Scholastics. "Comprehensive, profound, or philosophical knowledge," then, is a "digested, systematized knowledge" is Pilosophy, the one which is not studied in English-speaking countries, because it all is in Latin, and "Latin" here means translating Cicero, parsing Caesar, spelling Virgilius, and speculating about grammar and palaeography. In that system all that is known, all that is knowable, or ever can be known, is digested; and provided with pigeonholes for future facts and

proofs. A series of facts, a sphere of ideas or thoughts, or knowables, will be accepted as knowledge, or "science," when they can be demonstrated and applied as an art. Such a demonstrated and applied science becomes a profession. Any other knowables are neither a science, nor a profession, consequently they cannot become school-subjects. To this realm belong all the conceivable disputations on subjects like *the immortality of the soul, life, dreams, friendship, old age, love,* the German *Staatswissenschaften,* or *political economy, hygiene, politics, government, civics, sociology, socialism, or* anything the human mind can conceive, among them journalism, they are no new sciences, nor sciences at all, because they are neither systematized, nor demonstrable, nor applied as arts, consequently they are no school-subjects. But because they all are vague, for the very reason that they cannot be demonstrated, they appeal to lecturers mightily, for they require no definite knowledge, and open an unlimited field for preaching and idle talk. They begin nowhere, they lead nowhere, they end nowhere, and after ten years of preaching or listening to such preachings, one knows nothing, and has acquired no profession. These subjects produce Kants, Fichtes, Hegels, Schopenhauers, Hartmanns, Cousins, Marxes and a swarm of "philosophers," of which Germany is the chief hotbed. Education itself is one of these subjects, because also undemonstrable. Psychologia, physiologia and the like are somewhat different, for they are sidelines in Anthropologia, therefore Metaphysica, and, as an art, in medicine; but by itself neither of them is a school-subject. When, therefore, universities and colleges make "courses" of such matter, is another evidence that our schoolmen "have heard something," but they do not know one thing from another.

4. The sum total of all things known or knowable fall into two great groups: The Scientiae Humaniores, or *Humanitates,* and Artes Liberales, of course, misunderstood by our schoolmen.

Webster: "HUMANITY. 3. Mental cultivation: liberal education. 4. *pl.* (With *the*). The branches of polite or elegant learning, as language, rhetoric, poetry and the ancient classics."

Here the compilers leave the etymology alone, because the German classical dictionary cannot help them, and other Latin education they do not possess, and so, while we hear a good deal about "humanities," but just what they are, and why they are so called, nobody knows. What they call "humanities" are not *Humanitates,* or *Scientiae Humaniores,* but *litterae umaniores* or *Politiores;* these are not contrasted with Artes Liberales, the Humanitates are. This latter group is the main subject of high education, the former is the group called Belleslettres by the French. The humanities then are no college subjects at all, neither are the liberal arts.

When this great division was accomplished by the scholastics, and knowledge became tractable, first the Collegium, then the university was born, but much later the artes liberales had to be taken out, and the Polytechnicum was born on equal rank with the university. The latter two high (in proper sense) schools are the institutions of high education; to them belong all science, or high knowledge; one is the seat of the humanities, the other of the liberal arts; nothing belongs to college, because it is a preparatory school for both, the complement of the pro-gymnasium, or high school, with a set curriculum, and no choice of "courses."

Every school-subject must be a science, whether it belongs to the group of humanities or to that of the liberal arts, i. e., all must be demonstrable, and all must have two phases. One, the abstract, or *pure* science, *which* is called *Metaphysica,* that is beyond the a matter of reason alone; and an [illegible] that is, the application of the pure science, to knowledge; these are the "learned professions." In the liberal arts, say, architecture, or engineering, there are no doctorates, and so a Polytechnicum cannot confer any degrees; the scientific portion of these branches are comprised in Metaphysica, the central portion of formal Philosophy, on one hand being Logica, the art of thinking and reasoning; on the other Ethica, the science of moral doctrines; all else being Metaphysica, and an engineer, or architect must study formal Philosophy, and can obtain a doctorate in Philosophy.

5. The degree of Doctor, just like all else, is known to our schoolmen only from hearsay. How else could they confer a doctorate indentistry, surgery, perhaps also in pharmacy, or in other subjects? A doctorate is but a certificate qualifying the recipient to function as a professor of his subject in a university. But a doctorate can be given only for the pure science, not the art of a profession, and that pure science is always the philosophy, or metaphysical portion of the science, such as Ius Naturae & Gentium of Ethica, for Jurisprudence, or Anthropologia with its subdivisions Psychologia, Physiologia, Morphologia, etc., for Medicine. As these subjects are university subjects, it must be evident that no college of Law or Medicine can confer degrees, qualifying the recipient for a professorship in a university. A special college or academy of

Medicine, or Jurisprudence, can only issue a license for their alumni empowering them to practice the *art* of that respective branch, but such institutions cannot qualify them as "doctors."

When I speak with college people on this subject, they invariably tell me that the State Legislature has authorized their institution to grand degrees. My answer is: "Nemo dat quod non habet." Neither a Legislature, nor a Parliament, king, emperor, boards of any kind, can make me a physician if I am not one. A legislation can, and does, grant the *public right* to those who do possess the private, or natural right, to make use of their natural, or scholarly right. The only body of men who do enjoy this natural, scholarly right is the respective *Faculty of a University*, and no other body of men, let alone a single individual, whoever he may be. All degrees not so conferred are null and void.

Neither a university, nor a polytechnicum can invade each other's sphere of activity and functions. Much less can either, or even a college debase itself to undertake to "teach" *artes illiberales*, or *mercenarias*, otherwise called, *trades, commerce, accounting, washing, household management, cooking, stenography, journalism, banking, salesmanship, designing, or anything else for money-earning of the pupils.* A university disqualifies itself by so doing, and becomes a trade-school. So, too, when a university does not teach formal Philosophy as a department, nor the special philosophy required in each of the professions, all in Latin, of course, and if it teaches the *art*, or applied portion alone, it has no right to confer doctorates for such teaching, for its alumni are mere tradesmen, for the art alone is trade, not a profession.

When such are the conditions of education throughout the English-speaking world, on account of the initial failure in learning and teaching Latin, one cannot wonder at the severe words reported by a correspondent of the London TIMES' *Educational Supplements* "As a nation we appear to educated Frenchmen, inarticulate, illiterate, illogical, uncritical, intellectually naive, unskilled at transmuting raw facts into ideas. Our education seems to them to consist partly of empty verbalism, and partly of mere 'bricabracology.'"

PREPAREDNESS.

The great European war has aroused the appetite for war also on this side of the Atlantic Ocean, just like when a boy beholds another boy eating, begins to feel hungry and casts his covetous eyes on the apple of the other boy. We, too, must be "prepared," presumably for war, but, of course, on the same principle of "get rich quick," pile up guns, warships, armies. A nation that is not warlike by nature, that knows no restraint and discipline from childhood; a nation whose mind is never occupied with arms, where every man is as good as another, where other ideals wield man's actions, will require at least two generations before a new education could exert its influence upon the minds and character of the multitudes.

The first step, even toward orderly peace, must be the overhauling public education. The clamor against the inefficiency of our schools is a generation old. Distinguished business men, like Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Schwab, have openly declared our college-education useless. The former has instituted the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, donating fifteen million dollars for the purpose. Just what has been accomplished in that direction, I know not; but I know that Latin has not been improved, that formal Philosophy is still not taught; that false degrees are still conferred; that our schoolmen still know things from hearsay; that still nobody has defined the scholastic terms, no teachers of Latin are being professionally trained, and this initial ignorance is still vitiating all our education. Yet reform and revolution must come from the outside. Will the State, will the Federal authorities, or will the Carnegie Foundation initiate the educational revolution?

ARCADIVS AVELLANVS.
47 W. 52d Street, New York City.